REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and further examination are requested. Upon entry of this amendment, claim 1 is amended, and claims 13-18 are cancelled, leaving claims 1-12 pending with claim 1 being independent. No new matter has been added.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 13 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Celikkaya et al. (U.S. 2005/0056055).

This rejection is moot, since claims 13 and 14 have been cancelled.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 11 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reeh et al. (U.S. 2001/0000622) in view of Celikkaya.

Applicants submit that the claims as now pending are allowable over the cited prior art. Specifically, amended independent claim 1 recites a phosphor comprising an inorganic material of a crystallized glass, wherein when an excitation light including visible light is irradiated on the phosphor, the phosphor emits a fluorescence of complimentary color with respect to a hue of the excitation light, and a portion of the excitation light transmits through the phosphor.

The cited prior art fails to disclose or render obvious such a phosphor. In particular, Reeh discloses a luminescence conversion element composed of a transparent epoxy resin in which inorganic luminescent materials are bound (*see* paragraph 0049), or composed of an inorganic phosphor which is embedded in an inorganic glass of low melting point (*see* paragraph 0051). Additionally, the Examiner recognizes that Reeh fails to disclose a crystallized glass. For this element, the Examiner relies on Celikkaya.

Celikkaya discloses glass ceramics (crystallized glasses: *see* paragraph 0021 and 0027), which are made or converted into beads, articles, fibers, particles, coating and the like, for use in reflective devices, such as, retro-reflective sheeting, alphanumeric plates, and pavement markings, thermal insulation, filler, or reinforcing material in composites (e.g., ceramic, metal, or polymeric matrix composites), protective coatings in applications involving wear, as well as for thermal management, kitchenware (e.g., plates), dental brackets, reinforcing material (e.g.,

particles and fibers), cutting tool inserts, abrasive materials, and structural components of gas engines, (e.g., valves and bearings), protective coating of glass-ceramic on the outer surface of a body or other substrate; and particularly abrasive particles (*see* paragraphs 0033-0035, 0131-0135). However, Celikkaya does not disclose any glass ceramics (i.e., crystallized glasses) that when an excitation light including visible light is irradiated on the phosphor, enables the phosphor to emit a fluorescence of complimentary color with respect to a hue of the excitation light, and a portion of the excitation light transmits through the phosphor, as required in claim 1 of the present application. In fact, Applicants submit that none of these numerous structures of the glass ceramics disclosed in Celikkaya would inherently require or need to be capable of performing this claim limitation.

Moreover, there is no motivation for one skilled in the art to modify Reeh to include the glass ceramics of Celikkaya. Celikkaya merely discloses glass ceramics. There is no suggestion or reasoning in Celikkaya that the glass ceramics disclosed therein would have been suitable for use with the Reeh device. A patent composed of several elements is not proved obvious merely by demonstrating that each element was, independently, known in the prior art. *KSR International, Co., v. Teleflex Inc. et al.*, 550 U.S. 398 (2007).

Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable over the cited prior art.

Claims 3 and 7-10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reeh in view of Celikkaya as applied to claims 1, 2 and 5 above and further in view of Maegawa (U.S. 2002/0171911).

Applicants submit that since each of these claims is dependent from claim 1, and since Maegawa fails to overcome the deficiencies of the combination of Reeh and Celikkaya, each of these claims is allowable for the reasons set forth above.

Claims 15-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Celikkaya as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Maegawa.

This rejection is moot, since claims 15-18 have been cancelled.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all of the claims now pending in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner believe there are any remaining issues that must be resolved before this application can be allowed, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Shunsuke FUJITA et al.

By /Jeffrey J. Howell/
2010.05.12 11:48:11 -04'00'

Jeffrey J. Howell
Registration No. 46,402
Attorney for Applicants

JJH/ekb
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
May 12, 2010